United Nations A/C.1/49/PV.23

General Assembly
Forty-ninth session

Official Records

First Committee
23rd Meeting
Thursday, 17 November 1994, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Valencia Rodriguez . . . . . (Ecuador)

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

Agenda items 57, 58, 61 to 65, 71, 72 and 73 *(continued)*

Action on draft resolutions

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.22/Rev.1: France, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America;

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.1: Djibouti.

The Chairman: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. Hernandez (Argentina) *(interpretation from Spanish):* The delegation of Argentina wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1.

First, in the light of my delegation's position on the general situation in the Middle East, I wish to express once again our deep satisfaction at the great progress that has been made in the ongoing peace process, in particular following the Washington Agreement of September 1993 between the representatives of the Palestinian people and of Israel.

At the same time, Argentina supports the efforts of all countries of the region to achieve a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict and encourages them to continue those efforts. In this respect, we warmly welcome the recent agreement between the Kingdom of Jordan and Israel.

In the present context, these historic steps towards peace in the region are significant, and we do not believe that draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1 will really strengthen the process or improve the political climate in the region. On the contrary, it seems to us that the practice of singling out certain States selectively is not the most appropriate way to obtain the acceptance of international treaties by those States. Argentina takes the view that the concerns about the risk of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the region are reflected more faithfully and in a more balanced fashion in draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.16, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

Mr. Yativ (Israel): I would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21.

Israel attaches great importance to the establishment of regional confidence-building measures as a necessary step in promoting peace and security in our region. In the special area of regional security and arms control, there is in our view a necessary sequence of confidence-building measures that needs to be followed. It includes measures that in the first instance do not impair the national security of the negotiating partners and can be established on a bilateral or a multilateral basis. These are at the moment being negotiated in the talks of the Working Group on Arms Control and Regional Security in the Middle East.

94-87112 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178, and incorporated in a copy of the record. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

Once agreed, they have to be tested over time in order to establish real confidence.

Confidence-building measures of a more pervasive nature — and certainly arms control — require that all States of the region abjure war in settling conflicts and participate in negotiations, followed by a proven and durable peace. Such peace is of course contingent primarily on political accommodation. Israel has demonstrated good will and acted in several areas to establish confidence-building measures with its neighbours; these include the regional communication hub, the promotion of an agreement on search and rescue at sea and an agreement on early notification of predatory activities.

Mr. Than (Myanmar): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

Myanmar has been a consistent and ardent advocate of nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and other related nuclear-arms-limitation measures. However, we believe that a country-specific draft resolution such as the present one will not help achieve these goals. We are sympathetic to and supportive of the main thrust of the latter part of operative paragraph 1 and the whole of operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, which, without being country-specific, call on all States in the region to renounce the nuclear option and to adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty if they have not yet done so. However, we have reservations about the first part of operative paragraph 1, which singles out Israel. For that reason, my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

Miss Thomas (Jamaica): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1.

The Jamaican delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution because Jamaica is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and supports efforts to strengthen this Treaty and prevent further proliferation of nuclear weapons. In previous years Jamaica abstained on resolutions under this agenda item. We appreciate the efforts of the sponsors to bring a more constructive text to the Committee. However, we would have preferred that this text not make specific reference to a single State, as this merely contributes to tensions within the region, and we had hoped that this reference could be avoided in the light of the positive developments in the Middle East peace process.

Mr. Chandra (India): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on the draft resolution on Israeli nuclear armament, which is contained in document A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1.

My delegation remains fully supportive, as in the past, of the Middle East peace process and of efforts to build peace and security in the Middle East. While we are at one with the general thrust of the draft resolution, which is directed towards the reduction of the threat of nuclear armaments in the Middle East, we feel that it seeks to address the nuclear issue in a much-too-compartmentalized fashion. Given the global reach of nuclear weapons, the nuclear threat can be effectively dealt with only on a global basis, not on a regional one. We also cannot support the calls upon all States of the region to adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty, as in our view the Treaty is inherently flawed and discriminatory, dividing the world into haves and have-nots, and has done little to curb proliferation. Above all, regional arrangements should be arrived at only on the basis of agreement of all the States of the region concerned, which appears to be lacking in this case.

Accordingly, our delegation was constrained to abstain on this draft resolution. We believe that the Middle East peace process will help reduce the threat to security in the region and will also afford the opportunity to enter into appropriate regional disarmament and confidence-building measures on a consensual basis.

Mr. Baruni (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1, on Israeli nuclear armament. Nevertheless, we have reservations on certain provisions of the text that imply recognition of Israel. We have reservations also on all parts of the text that deal with the peace process in the Middle East. At a time when the international community is witnessing positive developments in many forums towards ridding the world of nuclear armaments and other weapons of mass destruction, Israel still possesses a large arsenal of nuclear armaments, which undermines peace and security in the region. Israel is perfecting these weapons and their means of delivery even more, despite repeated calls by the international community on Israel to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty and to subject all its nuclear facilities to the system of guarantees of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). My delegation believes that such calls are not sufficient in themselves: the international community should engage in further efforts to ensure the elimination of all Israeli nuclear weapons, in order to create a world that is more stable and more just for all parties.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union, as well as the four applicant States and Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Slovakia.

The States on whose behalf I have the honour to speak decided to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

We recognize that substantive and genuine efforts have been made *vis-à-vis* last year's resolution in order to accommodate concerns expressed. However, despite all these efforts, the draft resolution still singles out Israel. We had to abstain for the following reasons: The agenda item "Israeli nuclear armament" and the submission again this year of a draft resolution singling out Israel are not in the spirit of the peace process under way in the Middle East — all the more so since another draft resolution, relating to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, which calls upon all States in the region to adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty and welcomes the Mubarak Plan, is adopted each year by consensus. As a result, the group of States for which I am speaking has changed its common vote from "no" to abstention.

Mr. Starr (Australia): The Australian delegation has a number of comments on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1, on the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. My delegation abstained on that draft resolution.

The past year has seen a substantial improvement in the security climate in several parts of the world, including the Middle East, where there are good prospects of further progress in the peace process. In this context, the Middle East Arms Control and Regional Security Working Group has continued its constructive efforts, and Australia has been particularly pleased to support and participate in this work. Australia has consistently urged Israel and other States, both parties and non-parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to live up to the standards of international behaviour set forth in the Treaty. We appeal to the few remaining States not parties to the Treaty, particularly those that operate unsafeguarded nuclear facilities, to adhere to the Treaty.

Australia's abstention on this draft resolution, therefore, should not be interpreted as anything less than complete support for calls on Israel to adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty and to accept full-scope safeguards on all its nuclear facilities. We fully share the concerns expressed in this draft resolution; we also support the establishment in the Middle East of a nuclear-weapon-free zone and a zone free of weapons of mass destruction.

I would also like to comment on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.28. Our abstention on this draft resolution reflects our view that the subject addressed therein is more properly the business of the States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and of the Treaty Review and Extension Conference process now in train than of this Assembly.

I should like also to make a comment regarding Australia's abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.31, on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons. Australia has abstained on this draft resolution, because the idea of a convention banning the use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances continues to pose difficulties. It could have implications for the maintenance of strategic stability and deterrence. We would, however, support a single binding assurance by the nuclear-weapon States of non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States that are party to the non-proliferation Treaty or similar regional arrangements. The end of the cold war has brought about changes in attitude to the possible use of nuclear weapons, and substantial progress in nuclear disarmament has been achieved over the past three years in particular. Australia continues to support fully all such efforts, including efforts to promote strategic stability in particular regions such as South Asia.

Mr. Wu Chengjiang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): I would like to explain my delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.31.

China has always advocated a complete ban on and the total destruction of nuclear weapons. We believe that all nuclear-weapon States should unconditionally renounce the first use of nuclear weapons, guarantee not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States or nuclear-free zones, and start immediately to negotiate and sign a treaty on the non-first use of nuclear weapons against one another. We believe that there should be a convention on the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear weapons, under which all nuclear-weapon States would undertake the obligation to destroy all their nuclear weapons. The implementation of this convention should be subject to effective international supervision.

Based on that position, the Chinese delegation believes that certain language in draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.31 and

in the draft Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons annexed to it need to be discussed further. However, the Chinese delegation supports the purpose and objectives of this draft resolution.

Mr. Alvarez (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Uruguay voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21 in the light of our long tradition of supporting the implementation of confidence-building measures in the framework of strict respect for international law.

Nevertheless, Uruguay has significant reservations on specific provisions of the draft resolution adopted — namely, the seventh and tenth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 5. These include language that is not in accord with the traditional language used in this kind of draft resolution, as well as concepts that would be more appropriately dealt with in other contexts and are indeed being addressed in other forums of the General Assembly at this very session.

Mr. Madden (United States of America): I wish to address draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1.

As a first point, let me say that the United States fully supports universal adherence to the non-proliferation Treaty, and we have made that clear to all States that have not adhered to the Treaty, including Israel. That said, let me explain why the United States has voted against draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1, on Israeli nuclear armament.

Last year, in view of the changing circumstances in the Middle East, many delegations joined in voting against a draft resolution on Israeli nuclear armament that was one-sided. These delegations stood solidly behind a clearly defined principle — namely, that the draft resolution should not single out Israel for special treatment. Although this year's draft was improved in many areas over last year's text, it regrettably did not erase the distinction in the text between Israel and other regional States that have not signed the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty. We view this year's draft resolution as counter-productive and inappropriate, particularly considering recent progress in the Middle East peace process. In practice, this text does nothing more than duplicate the draft resolution on the Middle East nuclear-weapon-free zone, which we support and expect again to be adopted by consensus.

Mr. Ponce (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation regrets its inability to support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.21. Ecuador has thus departed from its traditional support for the draft resolution we usually adopt on confidence-building measures.

The drafting of the seventh and tenth preambular paragraphs and of operative paragraph 5, incorporating new and wide-ranging concepts of preventive diplomacy, departs from resolution 47/120 A and B and deals with evolving concepts that are being dealt with in other forums. Ecuador was unable, therefore, to support this draft resolution. Operative paragraph 5 also implies the intervention of third parties in conflicts without the consent of the parties to the conflicts or consultation with them. We hope that next year, when the sponsors prepare the draft resolution under this item, they will avoid including concepts that will cause such concerns to delegations, so that we may support a draft resolution whose main purpose Ecuador shares.

Mr. Jaguaribe (Brazil): I would like to explain the vote of our delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21.

We voted in favour of this draft resolution because we are strong supporters of confidence-building measures in the context of disarmament, the arms-limitation process and the improvement of the process of peaceful settlement of disputes, as set out in operative paragraph 1 of the present draft resolution. We feel, however, that the present drafting of operative paragraph 5 leaves room for ambiguity in relation to when and how the cooperation of other States may take place.

Mr. Tanaka (Japan): I would like to explain Japan's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.31.

Japan, the only country to have suffered a nuclear attack, honestly desires that the use of nuclear weapons, which cause unspeakable human suffering, never be repeated. It thus attaches great importance to efforts directed towards the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons. Japan considers that in the present international situation, where nuclear weapons do exist, it is more important to achieve steady progress in nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament through, for example, the efforts of nuclear-weapon States to take specific nuclear-disarmament measures through the strengthening of the non-proliferation Treaty and efforts to ban all nuclear tests, including the early conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, rather than through seeking to conclude a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, as proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.31.

Mr. Baruni (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): We abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21 because we had reservations about certain parts of it.

We welcome the Register of Conventional Weapons, and we stress the importance of providing information about purchases of weapons, but my country has in fact eliminated the use of conventional weapons by its forces. We therefore agree only with those provisions of the draft resolution covering transparency. Indeed, transparency in the military field should cover all types of weapons, including weapons of mass destruction and other similarly harmful weapons. Since the nuclear capability continues to exist in certain countries — and we have referred to Israel's nuclear capability — we have reservations about the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 3 and 5.

Mr. Madden (United States of America): Earlier today my delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.28, concerning the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

I would like to reserve the right to make a statement in explanation of vote at a later time.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

I call first on the representative of the United States of America, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1.

Mr. Madden (United States of America): On behalf of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Russian Federation and the United States of America, I am pleased to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament", which appears in document A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1.

This draft resolution is sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America.

This draft resolution notes and welcomes recent achievements in the nuclear field, including actions towards the ratification of START I and the Lisbon Protocol, the continuing implementation of the Treaty between the United States of America and the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (INF Treaty), steps towards reducing the number of nuclear weapons and removing such weapons from a deployed status, and agreements on the targeting of strategic nuclear missiles. The draft resolution also welcomes the accession to the non-proliferation Treaty of Belarus and Kazakhstan and states that similar action by Ukraine would be welcomed. Looking forward, the draft resolution urges early implementation of START II, encourages and supports the United States and the Russian Federation in their efforts to reduce their nuclear arsenals, and encourages them to continue to give those efforts the highest priority in order to contribute to the elimination of nuclear weapons.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.44 had hoped to have a single consensus draft resolution on this subject, as was the case last year. Unfortunately, this did not prove possible. We hope none the less that draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1 will enjoy widespread support among United Nations Member States and will be adopted without a vote.

The Chairman: I now call on the representative of Germany, who will make a statement on behalf of the European Union concerning draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.27.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): Speaking on behalf of the European Union and the four applicant States, as well as Romania, I wish to inform the Committee that we have decided, with some regret, that no action should be taken at this session of the First Committee on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.27, entitled "Code of Conduct for the international transfers of conventional weapons". We have taken this decision in the light of views conveyed to us by members of the Committee.

In agreeing to this, I should like to remind the Committee that the sole purpose of this short procedural draft resolution was to acknowledge the importance of the issue and to recommend that discussion take place in the most appropriate forum on all aspects of the question. It was never our intention to prejudge the outcome of those discussions with the adoption of this draft resolution. The countries for which I speak hope that it will be possible at a later stage to hold meaningful discussions on this

important matter, on which we believe it will be possible to find much common ground.

Finally, I should like to thank, on behalf of the delegations for which I am speaking, all the other sponsors of the draft resolution for their support and encouragement.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements.

Mr. Nayeck (Mauritius): My delegation wishes to make a brief statement on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.2, on the African nuclear-weapon-free zone.

The African nuclear-weapon-free-zone treaty has been on the agenda of the United Nations for more than 30 years, ever since the first nuclear explosion was detonated on the African continent. The Organization of African Unity (OAU) was seized of this matter as early as 1964, when the Heads of State and Government in Cairo declared their commitment to making Africa a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Regrettably, though, their laudable initiative has taken a long time to materialize.

My country is a party to all major disarmament treaties and was among the first to ratify the chemical weapons Convention. We believe, however, that some more constructive efforts are needed to refine the draft African nuclear-weapon-free-zone treaty; in particular, annex I to the treaty, defining the treaty's zone of application, has not yet been finalized. This should be a litmus test for those concerned as to whether they really want to see the whole of Africa a nuclear-weapon-free zone or have parts of Africa excluded from the zone. On the eve of the Review and Extension Conference on the non-proliferation Treaty, the world community will be closely watching whether the nuclear Powers declare their willingness to adhere to Protocol III of the Treaty, and therefore whether their commitments are genuine.

My delegation would oppose the dismembering of Africa and the territory of the States members of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) into parts, some of which would be in the African nuclear-weapon-free zone while others would not. We wish to see the whole territory of the States members of the OAU, as per all its resolutions, included in the African nuclear-weapon-free zone.

My delegation wishes to put on record its appreciation of the work done by the United Nations-OAU Group of Experts, which after only a few meetings has produced a draft treaty for an African nuclear-weapon-free zone. We insist, however, that another meeting of the United Nations-OAU Group of Experts be convened as early as possible to iron out the remaining outstanding issues of the treaty. As we shall be celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations next year, my delegation sincerely hopes that the long-overdue African nuclear-weapon-free-zone treaty will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union and on behalf of Austria, Finland, Norway and Sweden to explain our position on draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.38 and A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1, both of which are entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament".

We had hoped to see a single consensus resolution on this subject, as was the case last year. We regret that this did not prove to be possible. In particular, we regret that draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.38 omits the references to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons that appear in operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1. For this reason we decided to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1 but not draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.38. We hope very much that it will be possible to have a single consensus resolution next year.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.38, listed in cluster 1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.38, entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 9 November 1994. It is sponsored by Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. Since I hear no objection, I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.38 was adopted.

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1, also contained in cluster 1.

A recorded vote has been requested on this resolution.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1, entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament", was introduced by the representative of the United States of America at the 23rd meeting of the Committee, on 17 November 1994, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

India, Namibia

*Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1 was adopted by 122 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.**

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.2/Rev.1, which is listed in cluster 11. The financial implications of this draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/49/L.50.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of an African nuclear-weapon-free zone" and with programme budget implications as contained in document A/C.1/49/L.50, was introduced by the representative of Benin on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the African Group of States at the Committee's 20th meeting, on 15 November 1994. It is sponsored by the following countries: Australia, Canada, Gambia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the African Group of States, and San Marino.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.2/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. As I hear no objection, I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.2/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes.

Mr. Chandra (India): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on resolution A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1, which has just been adopted.

In our view, it is unfortunate that two draft resolutions should have been introduced on the same subject, namely, "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations and nuclear

disarmament". Given the fact that draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.38 had already been introduced, we saw no reason for the introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1; it was and is essentially a duplication. Moreover, we cannot go along with the laudatory references to the non-proliferation Treaty, given our own well-known views on the Treaty, which we cited earlier today in another statement in explanation of vote.

It is those factors that compelled us to abstain on this draft resolution.

Mr. Tauwhare (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom was happy to join the consensus on the draft resolution which has just been adopted on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa and the text of which is contained in document A/C.1/49/L.2/Rev.1.

We very warmly commend the work already done by the Group of Experts in drawing up the draft treaty. A carefully prepared and well-drafted treaty, acceptable to all States in the region, will be an important contribution to the cause of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and to international peace and security. We strongly hope that a treaty acceptable to all potential signatories can be completed and signed in early 1995. I might add that, given the difficult financial climate facing the United Nations, we were pleased to note from the programme-budget-implications statement that the costs of the meeting of experts envisaged in operative paragraph 9 are to be met by the redeployment of existing resources.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): As a consistent supporter of the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world, Russia supported the adoption without a vote of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.2/Rev.1, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa.

We believe it is important that the future treaty establishing such a zone in Africa not contain any loopholes whereby its nuclear-free status could be violated. All the nuclear activities of States within a nuclear-free zone must be placed under the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). We also believe that the transit of nuclear weapons through the zone is unacceptable, as is the stopping in ports or airports within the zone of aircraft or vessels with nuclear weapons on board, except in emergency situations or other *force majeure* circumstances, with the consent of the receiving party. At the same time, passage through the seas of the zone of vessels which do not have nuclear weapons on board but which are equipped with nuclear-power sources should be permitted.

Mr. Jaguaribe (Brazil): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1.

Although we regret that it was not possible to have a single draft resolution on this item, as in previous years, we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1 because we are in agreement with its basic thrust and content. We would like to state, however, that our favourable assessment of this draft resolution does not affect our assessment of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which is cited in operative paragraph 5. We support the non-proliferation objectives of that Treaty, but we believe that the draft resolution goes beyond strict non-proliferation objectives and creates a political statement with which we are not in agreement.

The Chairman: The representative of the Russian Federation wishes to make a statement.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): In the light of the statement made yesterday in the First Committee by the representative of Ukraine, Ambassador Zlenko, I should like to inform delegations of the following statement that was made yesterday, 17 November 1994, at a briefing for the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation:

> "In Moscow, we commend the efforts of the Ukrainian Government to resolve the question of Ukraine's accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons of 1 July 1968. In this connection, we note with satisfaction the news regarding the adoption by the Supreme Council of Ukraine of a law on the accession to that Treaty.
>
> "However, we cannot fail to take note of the fact that adoption of this law is accompanied by certain conditions, the contents of which are such that it is not clear in which category — as a nuclear-weapon State or as a non-nuclear-weapon State — Ukraine intends to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This question is of great importance, both in and of itself and in connection with the fact that in the Lisbon Protocol to START I, as well as in the trilateral statement by the Presidents of Russia, Ukraine and the United States dated 14 January 1994, Ukraine undertook the obligation to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear-weapon State.

"Answers to these questions are necessary, in particular because at the present time the depositaries of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons are completing work on a document on the security guarantees required by Ukraine as a non-nuclear-weapon State. We fully understand the importance of clarity with regard to all of these issues."

The Chairman: I have been informed by the sponsor of the draft amendments contained in document A/C.1/49/L.48 to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.16 that these draft amendments will not be pressed to action.

I would like to remind members that tomorrow is the last day of work for the First Committee, the Committee on disarmament and international security. For organizational purposes, I would recall that tomorrow action will be taken on the draft resolutions contained in the following documents: A/C.1/49/L.16, A/C.1/49/L.22, A/C.1/49/L.25, A/C.1/49/L.33/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.36, A/C.1/49/L.39, A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.17/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.1 and A/C.1/49/L.34/Rev.1.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.

ANNEX

Changes in recorded and/or roll-call votes

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1

Subsequent to the voting, the delegations of Bahrain, Guatemala, Kuwait, Nepal, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.